

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

FARZAD ALLAF-MOTEDAYEN,

Plaintiff,

v.

SONOMA COUNTY CHILD  
PROTECTIVE SERVICES, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 25-cv-03050-SK

**REFERRAL FOR REASSIGNMENT  
AND REPORT AND  
RECOMMENDATION TO DISMISS**

Defendants in the above-captioned matter have not yet consented to the jurisdiction of a magistrate judge under 28 U.S.C. § 636. Therefore, the Court does not have authority to make a dispositive ruling in this case and ORDERS that this case be REASSIGNED to a District Judge with the following Report and Recommendation.

On April 3, 2025, Plaintiff Farzad Allaf-Motedayen (“Plaintiff”), proceeding *pro se*, filed this action along with an application to proceed *in forma pauperis*. (Dkt. Nos. 1, 2.) The Court granted the application to proceed *in forma pauperis* but screened the complaint pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2). (Dkt. No. 4.) In its order, the Court explained why the complaint was deficient and set a deadline of April 28, 2025 to file an Amended Complaint. (*Id.*) The Court informed Plaintiff: “If Plaintiff fails to file an amended complaint by this date, the Court will reassign this matter to a district court judge with a recommendation that the action be dismissed.” (*Id.*) To date, Plaintiff has not filed anything more on the docket.

///

///

///


///

///

1 For the reasons stated above, the Court RECOMMENDS the district judge dismiss this  
2 action without prejudice. If Plaintiff wishes to file an objection to these recommendations, he may  
3 do so within fourteen days of being served with a copy of this Report. *See* 28 U.S.C § 636(b).

4 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

5 Dated: May 5, 2025

6 

7 SALLIE KIM  
8 United States Magistrate Judge  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28